UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,198	08/27/2003	Panagiotis Kougiouris	2000874.135 US1	5126

23483 7590 08/19/2008	EXAMINER	
WILMERHALE/BOSTON 60 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109	NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2176	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com
teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com
sharon.matthews@wilmerhale.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 May 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to Amendment filed 05/21/2008.

Claims 1-19 are currently pending. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

> *This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

Claims 1, 3-11 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being

unpatentable over of **Strong** (US 6167523, filed 05/1997) in view of

Clark et al. (US 6073163, filed 06/1997).

As to claim 1:

Strong teaches a method for automatically validating text that is input to a

client computer (See C*ol. 4, lines 16-37)*, the method comprising:

- at the client computer *(client),* processing a markup language file to

  receive text input, the markup language file comprising a description

  of a graphical user interface, the description comprising a GUI

  element enable to receive the text input (*performing validation … of*

  input data from electronic forms such as Hypertext Markup

  Language forms)[See Col. 3, lines 7-47;and Col. 7, line 1 –Col. 8,

  line 64];

- in response to processing the markup language file , displaying the

  GUI on a display screen at the client computer [See C*ol. 5. line 62*

  Ccol.6, line 14: display the form 280 to the client PC 200 user such

  that he or she may fill out the form];

- receiving text that into to the GUI element enabled to receive text

  input [See C*ol. 6, lines 5-21 & see fig. 3A and the associated text:,*

  entering input data into it various fields … A submit button 325 is

  also provided];

- in response to receiving text into the GUI element, sending a

  programmatic event to the validation manager [See *Col. 7, lines 5-*

  41: entry of data into the form 280, the form 280 is submitted by the

  client PC 200 user by clicking on the submit button 325… when the

  data 290 is received by the server 205 …the form data validation

  and processing program 255 controls data validation, error

  reporting and processing of the input data … after the data 290

  from the form 280 is received in step 400, the form validation and

  processing program 255 determines whether the data includes a

  first registry key identifier in step 405. If a registry key identifier is

  not identified by the program 255, then in step 410, a general error

  message is sent to the client computer system 200. The error

  message may indicate a server error, for example, or inform the

  client PC 200 user that the form cannot be processed]; and

- providing an indication that the received text is invalid if the

  received text is determined to be invalid [See *Col.3, lines 36-47;*

  Col. 6, lines 50-60 & fig. 7 and the associated text: For each field

  as it is evaluated, if the data in the field is invalid according to

  requirements specified in the one or more configuration registry

  keys, an error message corresponding to the field being evaluated

  is dynamically built and logged in an error log … if there are entries

in the error log, a detailed and specific error message is provided

to the user identifying the specific field(s) that included invalid data].

Strong does not specifically teach "*wherein the markup language file*

comprises a markup language tag for instantiating a validation manager at

the client computer; in response to processing the markup language file at

the client computer, instantiating the validation manager at the client

computer; in response to receiving the programmatic event at the validation

manager, determining at the client computer whether the received text is

valid text input."

Clark teaches wherein the markup language file *(HTML document)*

comprises a markup language tag *(client 252 may be a network computer*

that loads JAVA-enabled browser 254 … the HTML document has code …

the HTML document may contain a tag in the form of <applet cl arg>) for

instantiating a validation manager at the client computer; in response to

processing the markup language file at the client computer, instantiating the

validation manager at the client computer *(Upon receiving client-side code*

206, the JAVA interpreter within JAVA-enabled browser 254 begins

executing client-side code 206. When executed, client-side code initializes

the client-side)[See Col. 6, line 42 – Col.7, line 5; Col. 8, line 56 -Col. 9, line

28]; in response to receiving the programmatic event at the validation

manager, determining at the client computer whether the received text is

valid text input *[See the Abstract; Col. 5, line 58 –Col. 6, line 6, line 30; and*

Col. 11, lines 1- 26: user actions which operate solely within the user

interface, such as typing a series of characters into a text field, is handled

purely within the client-side code 206. Further, the operation of common

dialogs are able to operate completely within the client 252 until the user

performs a high level operation, such as "accepting" or "canceling" the

dialog. Other user actions, such as changing a checkbox or inter field

navigation … The client-side trigger processing may implement triggers

written in JAVA or another scripting language].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Strong with Clark because it would

have facilitated performing validation and controlling processing of input

data from electronic forms such as Hypertext Markup Language forms.

As to claim 3:

Strong teaches receiving text input to the GUI element is performed by a

user of the application provide text input to the GUI element *[See col. 5,*

line 62-col.6, line 21; col. 9, line 4-18 & see fig. 3 and the associated text].

As to claim 4:

Strong teaches an application providing text input to the GUI element *[See
Col. 3, lines 14-32; Col.6, lines 1-30; Col. 7, line 1-31 & see fig. 3A and the
associated text]*.

As to claim 5:

Strong discloses one or more attributes for specifying when text input to
the GUI element should be validated; the validation manager component
is operable to validate text input to the GUI element in accordance with the
one or more attributes specifying when text input to the GUI element
should be validated *[See Col.3, lines 11-47; Col.4, line 63- Col.5, line 22;
Col.7, lines 5-41; and Col.8, lines 1-64]*.

As to claim 6:

Strong teaches each of the one or more attributes for specifying when text
input to the GUI element should be validated corresponds to at least one
type of programmatic event; the step of said validation manager receiving
a programmatic event comprises the validation manager ignoring the
programmatic event if the programmatic event does not correspond to one
of the attributes for specifying when text input to the GUI element should
be validated [See C*ol.7, lines 5-41; and Col.8, lines 1-64]*.

As to claim 7:

Strong teaches receiving, among other things, clicking on the GUI element

[S*ee the clicking of a button icon discussion beginning at Col.13, line 49)*;

wherein said validation manager component receiving a programmatic

event in response to said providing text input to the GUI element

comprises the validation manager component receiving a programmatic

event corresponding to the action performed *[See Col.13, lines 49-59:*

upon the occurrence of an event … the clicking of a button icon …invoke

the action].

As to claim 8:

Strong teaches one or more parameters for specifying the default behavior

of when the validation manager should validate text input for GUI

elements described in the markup language file *[See Col. 6, line 22- Col.*

7, line 21 & see fig. 3B and the associated text].

As to claim 9:

Strong teaches one or more attributes for specifying when text input to the

GUI element should be validated; the validation manager is operable to

override the default behavior and validate text input to the GUI element in

accordance with the one or more attributes specifying when text input

received to the GUI element should be validated [See *Col.7, lines 5-41; and Col.8, lines 1-64*].

As to claim 10:

Strong teaches said validation manager indicating that the text input received to the GUI element is invalid comprises the validation manager requesting the application to alter the visual appearance of the GUI element *[See Figs. 4 and 5 and the associated text]*.

As to claim 11:

Strong teaches the validation manager displaying an informational user interface window [*See Figs. 4 and 5 and the associated text*].

As to claim 17:

The combination of Strong and Clark teaches the validation manager component is a Java object *[See Clark: JAVA Applet; Col. 6, line 52- 67 and Col. 10, lines 7-52]*.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark with Strong because it would have reduced network traffic by executing at the client-side the code responsible for generating the visual components to be displayed to the user.

As to claim 18:

Strong teaches the markup language is HTML *[See Col. 3, lines 7-32: Hypertext Markup Language]*.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over of **Strong** in view of **Clark et al.** as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of **Morcos et al.** (US 6167404).

As to claim 16:

The combination of Strong and Clark does not specifically teach "the validation manager component is a COM object."

Morcos teaches the validation manager component is a COM object *[See Col. 6, lines 12-65; Col. 9, line 26 – Col. 10, line 45: COM object]*.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Morcos with Strong as modified by Clark because it would have greatly reduced development time and effort required for electronic forms input data validation and processing.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claims 2, 12-15, and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including

all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, subject to

a final search.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicants' arguments filed 05/21/2008 are persuasive. However, new

grounds of rejection are set forth in the Office Action.

Applicant argues in substance that Strong does not teaches *"the markup*

language file comprises a markup language tag for instantiating a

validation manager at the client computer; in response to processing the

markup language file at the client computer, instantiating the validation

manager at the client computer; in response to receiving the programmatic

event at the validation manager, determining at the client computer

whether the received text is valid text input".

The newly applied prior art (Clark) is combined with Strong to teach *""the*

markup language file comprises a markup language tag for instantiating a

validation manager at the client computer; in response to processing the

markup language file at the client computer, instantiating the validation

manager at the client computer; in response to receiving the programmatic

event at the validation manager, determining at the client computer

whether the received text is valid text input" (see the rejection above).

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is

considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should

review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office

action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Contact information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone

number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on

Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug

Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private

PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is

available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from

a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

/Maikhanh Nguyen/

Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100